









OF

HON. JOHN J. PEARCE,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

ON

THE SLAVERY QUESTION.

---

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AUGUST 9, 1856.

---

WASHINGTON:  
PRINTED AT THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE OFFICE.  
1856.



## THE SLAVERY QUESTION.

---

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. PEARCE said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have been desirous, for a long time, to express my views and feelings on the great question that is agitating this mighty nation from its center to its circumference, but my feeble health has prevented the execution of that purpose until the present time; and even now I find myself so much debilitated that I can hardly hope to carry out my desire successfully.

Sir, my feelings are deeply interested in the absorbing question; and while I shall at least attempt to say something expressive of the sentiments of my constituents, it is not my intention to add fuel to the fire. No, I am free to say that a spirit of an inflammatory character has been manifested to too great an extent by both sides of the House; and I would much rather, were I able, pour oil upon the wounds than deepen or aggravate them.

Our common and beloved country is at this time in a state of excitement that is indeed alarming; never before was it equalled. There may have been as much feeling and bitterness in other years, both in this House and in the other end of the Capitol, by the representatives of the people, when the question of slavery extension was being discussed, and when that question had reached a crisis. But, sir, the feeling and excitement then were, comparatively speaking, confined there; now, the mighty people are moved; they are like the ocean, blown into tempestuous commotion by the fury-winds of heaven. Yes, sir, all that has passed heretofore, is only as "the cloud no larger than a man's hand"—but look you now: see how that cloud has increased until it darkens the whole heavens, and East, West, North, and South, you see the flood is coming! Yes, the great crisis has arrived, and must be met; and, Mr. Chairman, what is the cause of this lamentable state of things? You see the two great sections of the country battling with each other. A mighty struggle is going on; and I ask for what? And let the answer go home to every American's heart like a thunderbolt: It is a struggle between slave labor and free labor; and that not in the States where slavery is established, but in the Territories which

are held in common by the Union! You may look at the question in whatever light you please; you may connect with it other side issues, but, sir, it resolves itself into this one question: shall slave labor or free labor succeed in the Territories? Our southern brethren have reasons and interests which prompt them to toil that slave labor may succeed; and the North, the West, and the East, have reasons for struggling that free labor may prevail; and, sir, I propose to notice, in a general way, the reasons of both.

The great question of the South is that of self-interest. Every new slave State runs up a handsome per centum upon every negro owned in the South, by creating a demand for them; and as the principal wealth of the South consists in holding human beings in bondage, (the right or the justice of which I have neither the time nor the inclination to discuss at present,) the more slave territory that is added to the Union, the greater the demand; and of course the institution, which they say, and say truly, was entailed on them, spreads in a corresponding ratio, with all its national evils.

But the South has another reason why they desire slave labor to succeed, and it is this: that they may maintain their representative strength in the Senate and House. On what other question does the North and South differ about, to make them jealous of superior numbers in their representative force, any more than the East and the West? Does the North or the West complain when either adds to their representative strength? No; nor would the South, were it not for the slavery question. Does not, then, this second reason resolve itself into the first? And is not the great absorbing and only reason of the South for extending slavery, self-interest—the desire of gain, in extending a demand and a market for a traffic in human beings—the extension of an institution now violently demanded as a right by the South, which eminent southern statesmen, though dead, yet living in the memories of the people, have denounced as a national curse?

The reasons of the North are more numerous and more varied. There are in the North a few, and, sir, I may say but few, who are Abolitionists—real, *bona fide* Abolitionists, who would not only inherit slavery in the Territories, but ex-

tirpate it in the States, regardless of constitutional rights or social consequences. They found their hostility upon the conviction that the institution is a sin against God. They class it with the worst of sins, and in their misguided zeal would support measures to procure its abolishment everywhere, without regard to consequences. But, sir, I have said there are but few in the North, and I will say they are fewer now than in former years. If I understand the principles of that other party in the North, the East, and the West, now almost as the stars in heaven for numbers, which you have seen fit to call the "Black Republican," they, as a party, have no sympathy with those Abolition mad-caps. No, sir, our patriotism rises above our prejudices; and, though opposed to slavery in the abstract, we are willing to stand by and maintain the compromises of the Constitution as enacted and established by our fathers. We are not disposed to interfere with it in the States where it is already established, because it is secured by the compromises of the Constitution. We will teach our southern brethren by our example some regard for the sacredness of plighted faith—of the inviolability of *compromises*. But in the Territories where slavery does not exist—where it was absolutely prohibited by a compromise which has been ruthlessly and wantonly destroyed, we are determined to exercise our constitutional rights as freemen to prevent and prohibit its introduction. Who does not know that, with these conservative views, this party, stigmatized as "Black Republicans," has alike incurred the displeasure, condemnation, and spleen of the Abolitionists and pro-slavery advocates?

Then, sir, there are others in the North, who think with many good people in the South, that slavery is wrong—that it is an evil that has been entailed on them, and one for which they are not responsible; and let me tell gentlemen here from the South, that the great mass of the Republican party do not condemn them because their section is blighted with what we think an evil, moral, social, and national. No, sir, we would rather sympathize with you than condemn you. We know how this great curse (as we think it is) came upon you, and we are ready to defend your constitutional rights in the States, and even the institution we would so much dread ourselves, knowing that you have been educated in the midst of it, and that all your sympathies and interests are identified with it. But, as I said before, we are opposed to spreading an evil into virgin soil where the excuse that it has been entailed cannot be set up or urged.

But perhaps the great reason why the North, the East, and the West, oppose the extension of slavery, may be characterized as twofold; that is, self-preservation, and national pride. In view of these two sentiments, which pervade every rational and honest heart, let me ask, what good has the institution of slavery ever done for our country, to command our admiration or our approbation? In answering this question, we will necessarily have to answer another: it is, what evil has it done? But how can we best answer these questions? I imagine, by contrasting the North, where slavery does not exist, with the South, where it has its uninterrupted sway. And what is the contrast? What is the difference in point of population? Does not the North out-

number the South almost ten to one? Why this difference? Is the South not as old as the North? Then why, I ask, this discrepancy in numbers? Is it not because of the blighting influences of slavery? What is the difference in a commercial point of view? Have we not a great preponderance over the South? and has not the latter the same natural advantages for commercial operations? What is the difference in agricultural pursuits, or products? Examine the agricultural statistics of the North and South, and compare them, and see if there is not in the result an argument perfectly irresistible in favor of free labor. Now look at the almost incredible difference between the North and the South in point of manufacturing interests, and see what a sad commentary you find against slave labor when compared with free labor. Again, look, if you please, at the difference between the North and the South in point of internal improvements. Why, who does not know that the South is fifty years behind the North, in this respect? And has slavery had nothing to do with making this difference? See also the contrast between the North and the South in point of revenue to the General Government. Will you look at these statistics, and see? Would that all might not only look and see, but feel the truth, that the difference between free labor and slave labor is as the difference between the light of day and the darkness of the night.

These, Mr. Chairman, are some of the reasons why the North is opposed to slave labor, and thus seek to introduce free, instead of slave labor into the new States—a labor that gives to freedom such a superiority in numbers, in commerce, in manufactures, in agriculture, in internal improvements, and in ability to give a revenue to the General Government.

Now, if this contrast is a true one—if these statistics do not lie, it is a matter of self-preservation with the North, that slave labor should not be introduced into the new States, for this obvious reason: the northern States have their teeming millions, whilst the South has but a sparse population; and how rapidly are the former increasing in numbers, not only by a natural process, but look at the millions of foreigners crowding our shores, and seeking in this great nation a home.

Now, how long, at this ratio, will it be before we are pressed with a population as dense as that of the Old World; and do you not observe that this great foreign element do not, and will not, locate themselves in slave States? There is plenty of room for them there, and an abundance of vacant or unoccupied land that might be purchased at a low rate; but they touch it not, because they have their own notions of slavery, and associate with it the idea of tyranny and oppression; and it was this that led them to leave their own country to find a home in the land of liberty. Again, they will not go to slave States, because most of them are poor, and are seeking employment, and they find it not there. And let me ask, Mr. Chairman, what has given our country its great glory and superiority over other nations? First, it is because of our republican form of government; and secondly, it is because of the length and breadth of our Territories, the facilities offered to the poor of going to a new country, and

making themselves rich, and providing abundantly for their growing families. Why, sir, a poor man from the North, or a foreigner coming to this country, with five hundred dollars in his pocket, can go to Nebraska, or to Kansas, if it is a free State, and investing his little all in lands, by industry and economy, make a comfortable living, and in a few years, when he has passed the meridian of life, and his children have come to manhood, he finds himself not only independent, but his whole family well provided for; the country has been populated, improvements have been made, and he and his family have grown up with the country, become identified with it, and feel, as I have said, like independent freemen. But would it be so were slavery introduced there? Is it so in slave States? No! Look at the great free West, and tell me what it would have been if the institution of slavery had been introduced and tolerated. Her glory then would only be as the faint glimmering of a star in the dark cloud, to the brilliancy of the unobscured sun.

I have said, sir, that it is with the North a matter of self-preservation that compels an opposition to the introduction of slavery into the Territories; and I ask, when you look at our immense and increasing native population, in connection with the great foreign population coming in upon us like a flood, and both their interests alike antagonistic to the extension of slavery, do I not represent the facts and condition of things fairly and truly? I have also said that national pride has influenced the North in its opposition to the extension of slavery; and where is the American who does not, from his national pride, feel prompted to oppose every obstacle that stands in the way of national growth and expansion in population, commerce, agriculture, and general wealth? Sir, I need not repeat that other reason, assigned by others—the imperative duty of removing from us, so far as we can constitutionally, that which has made us, in the eyes of other nations, a hissing and a by-word. Sir, I have heard it said repeatedly on the floor of this House, that if the party who advocate the doctrine of free labor in the Territories, or who are opposed to the extension of slavery, should succeed, that the Union would be dissolved, and I confess that I have been amazed at these declarations. Now, if the party opposing the extension of slavery into the Territories were laboring to disturb that institution where it already exists in the States, and where it has existed coeval with the Republic itself, then I could make some allowance for such a threat. But I have neither known nor heard of any attempt to be made by this party upon the institution where it exists. On the other hand, this party is as much opposed to any interference of this kind as any political party in the country; their only opposition is to its extension—an opposition invited and legalized, if illegal before, by the Kansas and Nebraska bill repealing the Missouri compromise. In that bill the friends of the measure declare that it is the true intent and meaning of the act not to legislate slavery into or out of the Territory, but to leave the people free to say whether they will have slavery or not. This act only reiterated a right which we always had, and, though it is believed that the declaration in the bill was made in duplicity, we claim the right, as a portion of the people, to say that sla-

very shall not go into the Territories. In the face of the declaration thus made in the Kansas bill by the friends of slavery, I would ask, is the increase of slave territory the only terms on which the Union can be maintained? Is it so, that the fair lands of the West are to be appropriated to slave-breeding, and their wealth and promising advantages thereby blighted, as the only condition of maintaining the Union? Why, sir, the North has been charged with fanaticism on this subject. Is there no fanaticism in such declarations or conditions? Dissolve the Union because slavery cannot be extended! What has it done that it should be magnified into such importance? Will some one write or speak its eulogy? Has it not cursed your soil, paralyzed the increase of your population, produced indolence among your white population, and created indigence and misery? Are not these and other charges made against the "institution" true? and yet is it so, that it must be spread into the Territories, or the Union be divided? Would it not come with a better grace from the North, with her crowding population and her increasing enterprise, to say, that if slavery shall interpose its blighting, withering influence into the Territories, and there exclude her white population, the Union shall be dissolved? Yet the North says no such thing; and I hope she never will so far forget the memories of her revered ancestors, or the blood they poured out in the battles of the Revolution, as to be guilty of any such consummate folly.

But, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding these threats, the people of the free States are in earnest, and their determination is as immovable as the everlasting hills are firmly fixed; and I would say in all kindness and frankness to gentlemen here from the South, that they have but an imperfect idea of the extent of the anti-slavery extension spirit of the people of the North. A great contest is now going on in the nation for the Presidency; and if gentlemen here think that the Republican sentiment is confined to the friends of Mr. Frémont, they are greatly mistaken. No, sir, the feeling is almost as general among the friends of Mr. Fillmore. Why, sir, in the North, the American party, in many places, when calling a Fillmore and Donelson meeting, head the handbills "Friends of freedom, rally!"—and we call ourselves the American Republican party. Nor is the opposition to slave labor alone to be found among the friends of Fillmore and Frémont; for, strange as it may seem, many others are in favor of the views of this same despised Black Republican party who go in for Buchanan, and you will see the evidence of it in the future. Yes, many hitherto good and true Democrats are to be found who tell you they intend to vote for Buchanan, but further the deponent saith not; others spit upon the platform, and go for Buchanan, forgetting that the saliva falls upon the venerable sage himself, for he is no more James Buchanan, having lost his identity in the platform. Many have lost not only their identity, but even their lives, upon platforms. Others say nothing, but will do something, no doubt, in November; and, sir, a goodly number of others aver that they will not support any man who stands on the Cincinnati platform, and they will vote, some for Fillmore, and some for Frémont; and then this spirit is increasing, and what it may be by the coming

election is yet to be seen. It is due, however, from me to state, that the friends of Mr. Fillmore think themselves more conservative than those of Mr. Frémont. But, sir, this is a great mistake. On this great question there can be no conservatism. How can there be? What is the question? It is this: Are you in favor of extending slavery, or are you opposed to it? Who can show me an intermediate position? Neither would interfere with slavery in the States—yet both are equally opposed to an extension of the evil, and both, as they suppose, are resorting to the same lawful means to prevent it. Where, then, I ask, is the conservatism? I cannot see it; and if the success of the Black Republican party would dissolve the Union, why would not the triumph of the American Republican party, who avow the same principles, and are laboring to accomplish the same end, in the same way?

But it is not my purpose, in these remarks, to make political capital for, or against, either of the candidates, but simply to correct an impression that some have received, that the free-soil strength of the North is all to be found in the Frémont party. No, sir; and if many were not deceiving themselves, and all the anti-slavery-extension men were to unite, every northern State would report such majorities as would astonish and amaze the whole nation; and, sir, the time is very near at hand when, if slavery is extended by the means which have been resorted to in Kansas, all the free States will be a unit on that subject; party drill or affinities will be too feeble to prevent it. If such means are repeated, and sanctioned by the Administration, every other question will become subordinate to this one in the North, without distinction of party. And, now, Mr. Chairman, what sane man does not know that the present storm, increasing in violence every hour, and threatening danger, is the fruitful and legitimate offspring of Democratic legislation? What was the condition of the country before the "little giant" of the West, as his party is pleased to call him, laid his vile and barbarous hand on that sacred compact and compromise, made by the united wisdom and patriotism of our fathers, and tore it asunder with the ruthless ignorance or wickedness with which the savage of the plains rends the beautiful and harmonious mechanism of the watch to sport its wheels as ornaments? By this ill-timed and recalled-for-ambitious act he opened the flood-gates of excitement, sectional animosities, civil war, and bloodshed. Was not the country, sir, in peace and harmony? Why, sir, the old wounds were healed by this balm, and time had effectually effaced even the scars; and the country was like the setting sun, without an intervening cloud. The storm had long since passed, and all was quiet. And, sir, I ask, for what was the compromise violated? Gentlemen from the South have repeatedly said here that they did not ask for it—that it was a northern measure, pressed upon them, and they would have been unwise to have repelled the proffered boon. Sir, the secret is here: that same "little giant," that has almost doubly damned the once great and pure Democratic party, and stamped upon it the broad seal of infamy, led by a reckless, itching ambition, attempted a *chef d'œuvre* for the chief executive office of this great nation, which was to prostrate every rival, and

leave him alone in the line of promotion. He was playing the Bonaparte—snatching the crown from the Pope, and placing it on his brow with his own hands. The destruction of the peace of the United States was a bold undertaking for a small man. A gnat can worry a huge elephant into a storm of rage. It is much easier to tear down and destroy, than to build up. The "little giant" was but too successful in destroying the Missouri compromise, and setting the country on fire. A weak and passive Administration rather aided than imposed a barrier to the consummation of this purpose. But the "little giant" and the head of this Administration have been indignantly repudiated by the country—repudiated even by that portion of the Democratic party South, whose favor and influence the reckless act was perpetrated to conciliate and secure.

And now, sir, what is this great Nebraska Kansas bill? Who will tell me what I am to understand by it? In the North, we are told by the leading exponents of Democracy that it means squatter sovereignty, or popular sovereignty—the right of the people of a Territory to govern themselves; and this was the plausible and deceptive argument used during the passage of the bill. Senators from the South urged that it could not be productive of slave States, because they were weak, few in numbers, whilst the North had her hundreds of thousands of surplus population, and would always have the majority. And further, they urged that slavery never could go to Kansas; that the climate and soil were such as to render slave labor unprofitable. Northern Senators, participants in the act, went a step further, and declared on the stump, in the canvass following, that the repeal of the Missouri compromise would not only make Kansas free, but would carry freedom south, to the Isthmus of Darien! But now, sir, this doctrine of squatter or popular sovereignty is denied by gentlemen from the South, or rather its construction or interpretation is disputed—one branch insisting that it confers the right upon the residents, or interlopers, at any time, and without regard to numbers, to establish permanent rules and principles, which shall bind and govern all who may thereafter seek a home in it; while another branch says it confers the right to do so only when the population assumes a magnitude in numbers qualifying it for admission in the Union as a State. General Cass ranges himself with the class who advocate the first branch of construction. The General is honest, and thinks there can be no discrimination as to the time when the right commences, if the right is conceded at all. Southern gentlemen embrace and adopt the second branch of construction. But, ask the Democratic party's "little giant," the father of the bill, his views, and what does he say? Why, sir, in perfect keeping with his usual duplicity, he dodges an expression of opinion, and says it is a judicial question, and not one for him to answer. His is the non-committal of the fox, who informed his majesty, the lion, when invited to express an opinion of the odor of his den, that he had "a bad cold, and couldn't smell at all, at all."

Sir, we have the Kansas-Nebraska bill, with all its beautiful results; and the very party that prepared it, cannot agree as to what it means. The

North contends that it is an exemplification of the great doctrine of squatter sovereignty; and the South, that it is standing evidence that Congress has no power to legislate upon the subject of slavery, and that they have a right to go into the Territories, and to take with them the institution of slavery, just as the North has the right to take with them any species of property they may possess. In the agitation of this doctrine of squatter sovereignty, and the denial of any right in Congress to interfere in the Territories, we should remember, that there is a Territory lying beyond, but adjacent to, Kansas and Nebraska, watching our movements, and waiting to take advantage of the doctrine of squatter sovereignty, to introduce themselves into the Union with the institution of polygamy as a part of their political and religious rights. I refer to the Territory of Utah. In this case the new doctrine may place some members in an awkward predicament.

Now, sir, if there be any meaning at all in the Kansas bill, it is that the people of a Territory are to decide for themselves whether they will or will not have slavery—it is popular sovereignty; and whatever other views the party with which I am acting may take, I, speaking for myself only, with this interpretation of the bill, am ready to meet and fight the great question by it, and I am sure of success with but half a chance. I do not mean to say, that the principle laid down in the Nebraska bill is my preference. No, I believe the restoration of the Missouri compromise would be far better; but the South say, "If you restore the compromise, then we will dissolve the Union." Very good. Then let us meet the question on the principle of popular sovereignty, and I am sure it will lead to the same thing. It must be so. What does the bill say? In effect it says: Now, here is a new Territory; if the North can send more emigrants into it than the South, then shall the Territory be free: on the other hand, if the South can outnumber and outvote the North, then is the Territory to be made a slave State. And, Mr. Chairman, who does not see, that as the North and the South are deeply interested in the question—not only interested in it, but in many places excited almost to desperation, that both will pour in their population until the Territory cannot supply their actual wants. The South and the North will meet with all their interested feelings and prejudices; every means, honest and dishonest, will be resorted to to defeat each other; and can you imagine that they can settle the question without the shedding of blood? No, sir; and the first blow will lead to a general engagement; and what though you have an army there, the emigration will far surpass it. Now, if the Union must be dissolved in the event of the restoration of the Missouri compromise, then, sir, as the question must be met, I go for the Kansas-Nebraska bill, meaning as it does the doctrine of popular sovereignty; and if you ask me what then are the chances of free labor, I tell you they are as the chances of thirteen millions to six millions, and I do not blame our southern friends for cursing the doctrine of squatter sovereignty.

This, to my mind, Mr. Chairman, is a dark picture, look at it in any aspect you please, and I trust in God some other means may yet be presented that will drive away the threatening

ruin; and let me ask, what claim has the South on Kansas? Do they not seek to establish their institution there in violation of the compromise? Let us examine for a moment, and see how the slave and the free States stand, as to the proportion of territory ceded to, and occupied by each, as acquired by the General Government. As the exact area of our territorial acquisitions cannot be made, I will give their cost, and then see how they are divided:

Territory of Louisiana (purchased from France in the year 1803).....	\$15,000,000
Interest paid.....	8,327,353
Florida, (purchased of Spain).....	5,000,000
Interest paid.....	1,430,000
Texas, (for boundary).....	10,000,000
Texas, (for indemnity).....	10,000,000
Texas, (for creditors, last Congress).....	7,750,000
Indian expenses of all kinds, (say).....	5,000,000
To purchase navy, pay troops, &c.....	5,000,000
All other expenditures.....	3,000,000
Expense of the Mexican war.....	217,175,575
Soldiers' pensions, and bounty lands, &c., (say).....	15,000,000
Expenses of the Florida war, (say).....	100,000,000
Soldiers' pensions, bounty lands, &c., (say).....	7,000,000
To remove Indians, suppress hostilities, &c., (say).....	5,000,000
Paid by treaty, for New Mexico.....	15,000,000
Paid to extinguish Indian titles, (say).....	100,000,000
Paid to Georgia.....	3,082,000
	<u>\$832,764,928</u>

Many of the above items can be accurately stated; others can only be estimated. But our acquisitions of territory have cost us an immense amount, and led to large expenditures. The above is merely an approximation towards it. The expense of the Mexican war is given as stated officially by the Secretary of the Treasury in his report in 1851. (See Appendix to Globe, volume 23, page 21.) This was, as Mr. Clay said in his great speech in 1850, a war "made essentially by the South, growing out of our annexation of Texas;" a war into which the country was precipitated by the action of a southern President; a war of conquest, which Congress declared "was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States."

It was at the instance of the slaveholding section of the Union, and for its immediate benefit, that all our purchases of foreign territory have been made. It was most emphatically the South, and the voice of "southern councils," that led to the acquisition of Louisiana, Florida, Texas, and New Mexico; and as it regards all sectional issues—all questions of political ascendancy—all these acquisitions of territory have been made, and have operated, for the direct and immediate benefits of the slaveholding States.

Not one inch of territory has ever been purchased or acquired of any foreign Power, since the Constitution was adopted, at the instance of the free-States, or which was intended for their benefit.

Yet the free States have paid more than two thirds of the entire cost of all these acquisitions of territory, and the consequent expenditures since incurred. They have borne their full share in the wars which led to, or resulted from, these acquisitions, in the expenditure of money, and in the sacrifice of human life.

How has the purchased territory been divided? From the territory thus purchased, and paid for by all the States, five new slave States have been

admitted, having the following extent of territory and representation in Congress:

States.	Square Miles.	Senators.	Representatives.
1. Louisiana.....	41,246	2	4
2. Missouri.....	65,037	2	7
3. Arkansas.....	52,191	2	2
4. Florida.....	59,258	2	1
5. Texas.....	325,389	2	2
5 Slave States....	543,339	10	16

The free States, if any, are yet to be admitted! Kansas and Nebraska, unless the unjust legislation that opened these free Territories to slavery, and the violent measures adopted to establish it in Kansas, aided and abetted by the present Administration, shall enable slavery to take all, even that part once secured to freedom, and from which slavery was "*forever prohibited!*"

At a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, (over eight hundred millions,) we have obtained the Territory for these *five new slave States*, by which the slaveholding section have gained *politically* (and that is the all-important object) *ten United States Senators and sixteen members of this House!*

California, it is true, has been admitted as a free State; but it was the result of accident. The territory acquired of Mexico, like all the rest, was acquired for the benefit of the South. The discovery of the mineral wealth of California led to its rapid settlement and admission as a State, before slavery had time to be transplanted there.

Mr. Chairman, the party with whom I have been acting here have been charged with sectionalism; and why? Because they are opposed to the extension of slavery, and slaveholding States will not unite with them in the election of their candidate for President. Now, sir, if the charge be true, I ask the candid if it be not our misfortune rather than our fault? Must we not, in the very nature of things, either be sectional, or give up the great struggle? I am sure, if the South will join us, we will give them a cordial welcome—pledge ourselves to sustain their constitutional rights—give them their fair division of the patronage of the Government, as we will offer them, (should success crown our labors,) whether they unite with us or not. All this, and even more, would we do, but you spurn us from you—you anathematize us with bitter words, and with vulgar names—ay, more, when some of your own citizens, in the exercise of freemen's rights, did come, feeble though their numbers were, to represent their State in the convention held for all, you drove them from your State; and I ask, is there no sectionalism in this? Is there patriotism in it; or the recognition of the freedom of speech, or of conscience? Sir, what is James Buchanan but a sectional candidate? The great Millard Fillmore you have idolized—you even now glorify his administration, and call him a conservative man—then why do you not support him? Why is it that his old friends in the South are forsaking him in scores, and going over to Buchanan? Now, when you charge us with sectionalism, look to it that you are not yourselves so sectional, so extreme, that you desert the very man you admit stood by you; and why do you desert him? Simply because he says he was

opposed to the violation of the Missouri compromise, and you fear that he might favor its restoration. What, I ask, is all this but sectionalism—but ultraism? Look at Kentucky. The friends of Mr. Fillmore in the North had hoped, and had counted on Kentucky; but see how she has gone! What encouragement is this for conservative northern men? No, sir, the truth is not to be disguised; it is a sectional fight, growing out of a contest between free labor and slave labor, and the violation of a fair, sacred, and time-honored compromise; and the South goes for him who goes furthest, even the Cincinnati platform in which James Buchanan has lost his identity!

This, Mr. Chairman, I have seen from the first, and for that very reason I have gone for Mr. Fremont. Mr. Fillmore personally is my preference. I believe in his honesty, his patriotism, his great ability, but more especially would I go for him because he goes for the principles of the American party. But, sir, I must now go for John C. Fremont if I would see the party defeated who have brought all this trouble, this civil war, and blood on us. The great question stares us in the face, and must be met, and I would appeal to the opponents of the Democratic party, what chance, what hope have you of the election of Mr. Fillmore? Is there a single southern State that he can carry? I had hope at one time that there was; but now all hope is gone. Kentucky has shown her hand. Tennessee was considered favorable; but is there a man here that listened to the speech of one of her able Senators as he took his leave of Mr. Fillmore, that can hope for success there? Maryland has been thought most sure of all the southern States; but both her Senators, Mr. Pearce and Mr. Pratt, have come out openly for Buchanan; and I ask the friends of Mr. Fillmore, to what southern State can you look with confidence? To my mind it is hopeless; and in view of this determination of the South, what will the North do? What ought she to do? Throw away her votes, give up the great struggle for free labor, submit tamely to the violation of the Missouri compromise, the wrongs and outrages perpetrated on the free-State people of Kansas, while their blood cries for an avenger, and the smoldering ashes of their dwellings are pleading their cause? Submit tamely while even your own statesmen, your brethren are now confined in prisons and wearing chains for the pretended violation of infamous laws, passed by a "bogus" Legislature—a Legislature elected by fraudulent voters from Missouri, enacting laws which would have disgraced the dark ages, and which were condemned as unconstitutional even by a Democratic Senate! Submit without offering relief to these men, still confined in their dark and gloomy cells for exercising the right of freedom of judgment and freedom of speech, though all these wrongs and sufferings are appealing to you?

What, I ask, will you do? For my part I have made up my mind to go for the candidate who will carry with him the North, the East, and the West, just as surely as did the Republicans elect Blair in Missouri, or as the State of Iowa gave six thousand majority for them.



